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tw: gun violence

tw: suicide

no explicit descriptions, just statistics

## 1nc

### 1nc – da

#### Most campuses restrict guns on campus right now.

AC 16 Armed Campuses. “Guns on Campus’ Laws for Public Colleges and Universities” 2016. <http://www.armedcampuses.org>

The overwhelming majority of the 4,400 colleges and universities in the United States prohibit the carrying of firearms on their campuses. These gun-free policies have helped to make our post-secondary education institutions some of the safest places in the country. For example, a 2001 U.S. Department of Education study found that the overall homicide rate at post-secondary education institutions was 0.07 per 100,000 students in 1999.1 By comparison, the criminal homicide rate in the United States as a whole was 5.7 per 100,000 persons overall in 1999, and 14.1 per 100,000 for persons ages 17 to 29. A Department of Justice study found that 93% of violent crimes that victimize college students occur off campus.2

#### Guns are protected as symbolic speech.

Blanchfield 14 Patrick ~Freelance Writer; PhD in Comparative Literature, Emory University~. "What do Guns Say?" The New York Times. 04 May 2014. https://opinionator.blogs.nytimes.com/2014/05/04/what-do-guns-say/.

Bunkerville is simply the next step in a trend that has been ramping up for some time. Since the election of Barack Obama, guns have appeared in the public square in a way unprecedented since the turbulent 1960s and ’70s — carried alongside signs and on their own since before the Tea Party elections, in a growing phenomenon of “open carry” rallies organized by groups like the Modern American Revolution and OpenCarry.org, and in the efforts by gun rights activists to carry assault weapons into the Capitol buildings in New Mexico and Texas (links to video). According to open carry advocates, their presence in public space represents more than just an expression of their Second Amendment rights, it’s a statement, an “educational,” communicative act — in short, an exercise of their First Amendment freedom of speech. (See this, from the group Ohio Carry, and this Michigan lawsuit.) This claim bears serious consideration. The First Amendment has historically been much harder to limit than the Second, and so extending the freedom of speech to the open display of weapons raises several urgent questions about how we understand the relationship between expressing ideas and making threats, between what furthers dialogue and what ends it. But are guns speech? Is carrying a weapon as an act of public protest constitutionally protected under the First Amendment? And if so, what do guns say? The courts have traditionally recognized “symbolic speech” — actions that convey a clear message — as deserving of First Amendment protection (by, for example, protecting the right of students in Des Moines to wear armbands protesting the Vietnam War). As “the expression of an idea through an activity,” symbolic speech depends heavily on the context within which it occurs. Unlike pure speech, symbolic speech is more susceptible to limitation, as articulated by the Warren court’s 1968 ruling in United States v. O’Brien. The outcome of that case, the O’Brien test, establishes a four-pronged series of qualifications for determining when symbolic speech can be limited: (1) Any limitation must be within the state’s constitutional powers; (2) the limitation must be driven by a compelling governmental interest; (3) that countervailing interest must be unrelated to the content of the speech, touching solely on the “non-communicative aspect” of the act in question; and (4) any limitation must be narrowly tailored and prohibit no more speech than absolutely necessary. In practical terms, this litmus test suggests that you can carry a gun as symbolic speech, particularly in the context of a pro-Second Amendment demonstration. The state’s clear interest in maintaining public order can be narrowly satisfied by demanding that protesters either carry guns that are unloaded — at least with an open chamber — or which otherwise have the barrel or action blocked. Thus far, open carry protesters have largely followed this rule, notably by sticking tiny American flags into their guns. “If the SWAT team comes down and starts surrounding us with tactical gear, it only takes a minute to pull them out,” the organizer of one such event told reporters. “But that’s not going to happen.”

#### Gun bans on campus solve suicide and accidental deaths.

DeFillipis 14 Evan, graduated number one in his class at the University of Oklahoma with degrees in Economics, Political Science, and Psychology. He is a Harry S. Truman Scholar, a David L. Boren Critical Languages Scholar, and currently works as a research analyst at Quest Opportunity Fund. His work on gun violence has been featured in Washington Post, Atlantic, Slate, VICE, Huffington Post, Vox, Media Matters, Boston Review, and many others. “Campus Gun Control Works- Why Guns and Schools Do Not Mix” Jun 07, 2014. https://www.armedwithreason.com/campus-gun-control-works-why-guns-and-schools-do-not-mix/ SA-IB

Accidents Happen Even without the presence of alcohol, accidents happen much more often than gun advocates would like to admit. And when accidents happen with guns, they are often deadly. Individuals in households with firearms, for example, are four times more likely to die of accidental death than those in households without firearms. The NRA supports bills that permit guns to be carried in vehicles on school grounds, arguing that firearm owners should not be punished for accidentally leaving a gun in their car. Curiously, there seems to be little concern for what happens if the same careless owner accidentally forgets to lock his car, accidentally fails to put the safety on, or accidently pulls the trigger, ad infinitum. It seems clear that there are many more ways to accidentally go wrong with a gun than there are ways to go right, and this is especially true in a densely populated, anxiety-ridden, alcohol-saturated, hormone-fueled school environment.Guns and Suicide While suicide is the second leading cause of death among college students, the rate of about 6.5 to 7.5 per 100,000 is roughly half that of a matched non-student population. The difference in suicide rates between student and non-student populations is explained almost completely by the reduced access to firearms on college campuses. Consider that suicides committed with firearms represent only five percent of suicide attempts but more than half of suicide fatalities. About 1,100 college students commit suicide each year, and another 24,000 attempt to do so. Given that suicide attempts with a firearm are successful 90 percent of the time, each one of these more than 25,000 attempts would almost certainly result in death if carried out with a firearm. The best studies to date show that the majority of suicides are impulsive, with little deliberation prior to the act. We also know that youths between the ages of eighteen and twenty-five experience the highest rates of mental illness in the general population. These factors, combined with high rates of alcohol and drug abuse, provide a compelling reason to believe that the nation’s suicide rate will increase if firearms are allowed on college campuses.

### 1nc – cp

#### Counterplan Text: Public colleges and universities in the United States ought to only restrict constitutionally protected speech in order to prohibit firearms on campus. DeFillipis 14:

Evan, graduated number one in his class at the University of Oklahoma with degrees in Economics, Political Science, and Psychology. He is a Harry S. Truman Scholar, a David L. Boren Critical Languages Scholar, and currently works as a research analyst at Quest Opportunity Fund. His work on gun violence has been featured in Washington Post, Atlantic, Slate, VICE, Huffington Post, Vox, Media Matters, Boston Review, and many others. “Campus Gun Control Works- Why Guns and Schools Do Not Mix” Jun 07, 2014. https://www.armedwithreason.com/campus-gun-control-works-why-guns-and-schools-do-not-mix/ SA-IB

The most recent survey of firearm ownership on college campuses found that gun-owning students are more likely than non–gun owning students to engage in dangerous behavior such as binge drinking and, when inebriated, participate in activities that increase the risk of life-threatening injury to themselves and others. These include drunk driving, vandalism, and physical violence. Given excessive consumption of drugs and alcohol on campus, the best a college can do is take precautionary measures to minimize the chance that lapses in judgment and drug- or alcohol-induced impulsivity will become lethal in the presence of a firearm. The only way to do this is to prohibit or at least strictly control guns on campus. It is simply not possible for campus police to monitor every party to ensure that those possessing guns are sober enough to do so. In any case, gun control is practically required in light of court rulings that force universities to provide safe premises to residents and visitors. Universities can be held liable for criminal assault on school grounds and for negligence in connection with social life on campus.

#### It competes. Blanchfield 14:

Blanchfield, Patrick ~Freelance Writer; PhD in Comparative Literature, Emory University~. "What do Guns Say?" The New York Times. 04 May 2014. https://opinionator.blogs.nytimes.com/2014/05/04/what-do-guns-say/.

Bunkerville is simply the next step in a trend that has been ramping up for some time. Since the election of Barack Obama, guns have appeared in the public square in a way unprecedented since the turbulent 1960s and ’70s — carried alongside signs and on their own since before the Tea Party elections, in a growing phenomenon of “open carry” rallies organized by groups like the Modern American Revolution and OpenCarry.org, and in the efforts by gun rights activists to carry assault weapons into the Capitol buildings in New Mexico and Texas (links to video). According to open carry advocates, their presence in public space represents more than just an expression of their Second Amendment rights, it’s a statement, an “educational,” communicative act — in short, an exercise of their First Amendment freedom of speech. (See this, from the group Ohio Carry, and this Michigan lawsuit.) This claim bears serious consideration. The First Amendment has historically been much harder to limit than the Second, and so extending the freedom of speech to the open display of weapons raises several urgent questions about how we understand the relationship between expressing ideas and making threats, between what furthers dialogue and what ends it. But are guns speech? Is carrying a weapon as an act of public protest constitutionally protected under the First Amendment? And if so, what do guns say? The courts have traditionally recognized “symbolic speech” — actions that convey a clear message — as deserving of First Amendment protection (by, for example, protecting the right of students in Des Moines to wear armbands protesting the Vietnam War). As “the expression of an idea through an activity,” symbolic speech depends heavily on the context within which it occurs. Unlike pure speech, symbolic speech is more susceptible to limitation, as articulated by the Warren court’s 1968 ruling in United States v. O’Brien. The outcome of that case, the O’Brien test, establishes a four-pronged series of qualifications for determining when symbolic speech can be limited: (1) Any limitation must be within the state’s constitutional powers; (2) the limitation must be driven by a compelling governmental interest; (3) that countervailing interest must be unrelated to the content of the speech, touching solely on the “non-communicative aspect” of the act in question; and (4) any limitation must be narrowly tailored and prohibit no more speech than absolutely necessary. In practical terms, this litmus test suggests that you can carry a gun as symbolic speech, particularly in the context of a pro-Second Amendment demonstration. The state’s clear interest in maintaining public order can be narrowly satisfied by demanding that protesters either carry guns that are unloaded — at least with an open chamber — or which otherwise have the barrel or action blocked. Thus far, open carry protesters have largely followed this rule, notably by sticking tiny American flags into their guns. “If the SWAT team comes down and starts surrounding us with tactical gear, it only takes a minute to pull them out,” the organizer of one such event told reporters. “But that’s not going to happen.”

### 1nc – campus cops

#### Counterplan text: Public colleges and universities in the United States ought to only restrict constitutionally protected speech in order to ban campus police officers from carrying guns. Buhrmaster 03:

Scott, Managing Editor for PoliceOne.com and the Director of Training for the PoliceOne Training Network. “Should campus cops carry guns? One college president says no.” November 18, 2003. https://www.policeone.com/school-violence/articles/72520-Should-campus-cops-carry-guns-One-college-president-says-no/ sa-ib

Columbus State Community College (OH) President Val Moeller doesn’t want guns on her campus. Understandable -- when it comes to the institution’s civilian faculty and nearly 23,000 students -- but extremely controversial when you realize that Moeller’s resolve to maintain a firearms-free environment extends to the sworn officers who make up the college’s police force. "The question of whether our agency should be armed is a highly volatile issue," CSCC Police Chief Mike Stritenberger told PoliceOne. "Our officers are very emotional about it, as well they should be. I fully support their interest in being allowed to carry firearms. Firearms and police officers go together. In my more than 30 years of sworn law enforcement work, this is the first position I’ve taken where carrying a firearm is not allowed." President Moeller’s thinking was made clear, at least in part, on a "Chat with the President" forum based on the Columbus State Intranet system. When asked to explain her anti-armed officer position she replied, "Much of the research shows that having armed public safety officers on campus increases the chances for more violence."

#### It competes – guns are protected as symbolic speech. Blanchfield 14:

Patrick, Freelance Writer; PhD in Comparative Literature, Emory University. "What do Guns Say?" The New York Times. 04 May 2014. https://opinionator.blogs.nytimes.com/2014/05/04/what-do-guns-say/.

Bunkerville is simply the next step in a trend that has been ramping up for some time. Since the election of Barack Obama, guns have appeared in the public square in a way unprecedented since the turbulent 1960s and ’70s — carried alongside signs and on their own since before the Tea Party elections, in a growing phenomenon of “open carry” rallies organized by groups like the Modern American Revolution and OpenCarry.org, and in the efforts by gun rights activists to carry assault weapons into the Capitol buildings in New Mexico and Texas (links to video). According to open carry advocates, their presence in public space represents more than just an expression of their Second Amendment rights, it’s a statement, an “educational,” communicative act — in short, an exercise of their First Amendment freedom of speech. (See this, from the group Ohio Carry, and this Michigan lawsuit.) This claim bears serious consideration. The First Amendment has historically been much harder to limit than the Second, and so extending the freedom of speech to the open display of weapons raises several urgent questions about how we understand the relationship between expressing ideas and making threats, between what furthers dialogue and what ends it. But are guns speech? Is carrying a weapon as an act of public protest constitutionally protected under the First Amendment? And if so, what do guns say? The courts have traditionally recognized “symbolic speech” — actions that convey a clear message — as deserving of First Amendment protection (by, for example, protecting the right of students in Des Moines to wear armbands protesting the Vietnam War). As “the expression of an idea through an activity,” symbolic speech depends heavily on the context within which it occurs. Unlike pure speech, symbolic speech is more susceptible to limitation, as articulated by the Warren court’s 1968 ruling in United States v. O’Brien. The outcome of that case, the O’Brien test, establishes a four-pronged series of qualifications for determining when symbolic speech can be limited: (1) Any limitation must be within the state’s constitutional powers; (2) the limitation must be driven by a compelling governmental interest; (3) that countervailing interest must be unrelated to the content of the speech, touching solely on the “non-communicative aspect” of the act in question; and (4) any limitation must be narrowly tailored and prohibit no more speech than absolutely necessary. In practical terms, this litmus test suggests that you can carry a gun as symbolic speech, particularly in the context of a pro-Second Amendment demonstration. The state’s clear interest in maintaining public order can be narrowly satisfied by demanding that protesters either carry guns that are unloaded — at least with an open chamber — or which otherwise have the barrel or action blocked. Thus far, open carry protesters have largely followed this rule, notably by sticking tiny American flags into their guns. “If the SWAT team comes down and starts surrounding us with tactical gear, it only takes a minute to pull them out,” the organizer of one such event told reporters. “But that’s not going to happen.”

#### Cops aren’t required to report their gun use. Press 15:

Associated Press in New York. “More US campus police officers now carry guns, report finds” January 20, 2015. https://www.theguardian.com/education/2015/jan/20/more-campus-police-officers-now-carry-guns-report-finds sa-ib

Nearly all campus police officers at public universities now carry guns, pepper spray and other weapons, according to a new justice department report. In addition, experts say more private schools are now looking to arm police. Overall, about two-thirds of public and private campuses used armed officers during the 2011-12 school year, according to the Bureau of Justice Statistics survey of 900 four-year colleges with at least 2,500 students. Officers at public universities were more than twice as likely as those at private schools to carry guns. Despite the increase, schools are not required to report weapon use to federal authorities. Experts said campus administrators are increasingly pressed for assurances that officers are well-equipped and well-trained following high-profile crimes like the 2007 Virginia Tech shootings and the Penn State child sex abuse case. “Compared to 10 years ago, we’ve made drastic improvements to become more professional, more accountable and more responsive to the expectation of our campus community,” said the Florida State University police chief, David Perry, who serves as president of the International Association of Campus Law Enforcement Administrators. “Parents are asking up front … do you have weapons, can you respond to an active shooter if there was a situation on your campus?” he said. The Bureau of Justice Statistics last surveyed campus law enforcement agencies in 2004-05. On the more than 700 campuses questioned for both reports, the percentage of agencies arming their officers rose from 68% to 75%. About 32,000 people were working full-time for campus law enforcement at four-year institutions in 2011-12, the most recent statistics available. About 92% of public campuses used sworn police officers, those with full arrest powers, and most sworn officers were authorised to carry guns, pepper spray and batons and to patrol beyond campus boundaries, the report said. About 40% could carry a stun gun. Federal authorities do not track how often weapons are used, the report’s author, BJS senior statistician Brian Reaves, said. “There is no DOJ requirement for reporting the use of weapons by police,” Reaves said by email. “The individual agencies would likely have records of this, but DOJ does not attempt to collect this information as part of any systematic data collection.”

#### Campus cops escalate small infractions and target people of color. Quinlan 16:

Casey, reporter for ThinkProgress, previously an editor for U.S. News and World Report. “5 Things That Make It Hard to Be a Black Student at a Mostly White College” January 25, 2016. sa-ib

Being targeted by campus police **The number of armed officers at universities has gone up in the past decade**, a U.S. Department of Justice report shows. During the 2011-2012 school year, 91 percent of public colleges had armed police officers. There has also been a recent uptick in the percentage of private and public colleges that employ officers who carry guns, from 68 percent in the 2004-2005 school year to 75 percent in 2011-2012. **There is already distrust between safety officers and black college students, who are often profiled** by police officers off campus, and **there has been a record of** safety **officers unnecessarily criminalizing small infractions or stepping outside of their authority** when they approach black college students. For example, Portland State University students and Black Lives Matter activists protested the introduction of weapons to the campus police force due to concerns about who would be targeted by campus police.Black college students are often stopped by officers for very minor issues. In September, a black college student who attended Hinds Community College in Mississippi was stopped by a campus police officer who said his pants violated the college dress code. When the student refused to show his ID, he was arrested for a failure to comply. Yet, after the incident, the college said he had not violated the dress code.

### 1nc – solvency

#### Prohibitions on guns on campus work – empirics – no disads because colleges in 38 states already do the cp. DeFillipis 14:

Evan, graduated number one in his class at the University of Oklahoma with degrees in Economics, Political Science, and Psychology. He is a Harry S. Truman Scholar, a David L. Boren Critical Languages Scholar, and currently works as a research analyst at Quest Opportunity Fund. His work on gun violence has been featured in Washington Post, Atlantic, Slate, VICE, Huffington Post, Vox, Media Matters, Boston Review, and many others. “Campus Gun Control Works- Why Guns and Schools Do Not Mix” Jun 07, 2014. https://www.armedwithreason.com/campus-gun-control-works-why-guns-and-schools-do-not-mix/ SA-IB

But while American schools may be less safe than their international counterparts, they are still among the safest places in the United States. Among school-age children, less than 1 percent of homicides occur either on school grounds or on the way to school, even though far more than 1 percent of students’ time is spent in school and en route. A Justice Department study showed that, between 1995 and 2002, college students between the ages of eighteen and twenty-four experienced 24 percent less violence than non-college students in the same age group. When college students experienced violence, it occurred off-campus 93 percent of the time. These sanguine statistics are a reflection of the near universal prohibition of firearms by academic institutions. At least thirty-eight states ban firearms on school grounds, and sixteen explicitly prohibit concealed carry on campus. Such policies enjoy massive public support: according to one survey carried out by researchers at the Harvard School of Public Health, 94 percent of Americans feel less safe when fellow citizens “bring their guns into restaurants, college campuses, sports stadiums, bars, hospitals, or government buildings” and “overwhelmingly, the public believes that in many venues gun carrying should be prohibited.” So just what sort of effect would guns on school grounds have? For starters, we can be confident they would not decrease school violence.

#### CP solves accidental death from guns. DeFillipis 14:

Evan, graduated number one in his class at the University of Oklahoma with degrees in Economics, Political Science, and Psychology. He is a Harry S. Truman Scholar, a David L. Boren Critical Languages Scholar, and currently works as a research analyst at Quest Opportunity Fund. His work on gun violence has been featured in Washington Post, Atlantic, Slate, VICE, Huffington Post, Vox, Media Matters, Boston Review, and many others. “Campus Gun Control Works- Why Guns and Schools Do Not Mix” Jun 07, 2014. https://www.armedwithreason.com/campus-gun-control-works-why-guns-and-schools-do-not-mix/ SA-IB

Accidents Happen Even without the presence of alcohol, accidents happen much more often than gun advocates would like to admit. And when accidents happen with guns, they are often deadly. Individuals in households with firearms, for example, are four times more likely to die of accidental death than those in households without firearms. The NRA supports bills that permit guns to be carried in vehicles on school grounds, arguing that firearm owners should not be punished for accidentally leaving a gun in their car. Curiously, there seems to be little concern for what happens if the same careless owner accidentally forgets to lock his car, accidentally fails to put the safety on, or accidently pulls the trigger, ad infinitum. It seems clear that there are many more ways to accidentally go wrong with a gun than there are ways to go right, and this is especially true in a densely populated, anxiety-ridden, alcohol-saturated, hormone-fueled school environment.

#### Solves impulsive suicide - empirics. DeFillipis 14:

Evan, graduated number one in his class at the University of Oklahoma with degrees in Economics, Political Science, and Psychology. He is a Harry S. Truman Scholar, a David L. Boren Critical Languages Scholar, and currently works as a research analyst at Quest Opportunity Fund. His work on gun violence has been featured in Washington Post, Atlantic, Slate, VICE, Huffington Post, Vox, Media Matters, Boston Review, and many others. “Campus Gun Control Works- Why Guns and Schools Do Not Mix” Jun 07, 2014. https://www.armedwithreason.com/campus-gun-control-works-why-guns-and-schools-do-not-mix/ SA-IB

Guns and Suicide While suicide is the second leading cause of death among college students, the rate of about 6.5 to 7.5 per 100,000 is roughly half that of a matched non-student population. The difference in suicide rates between student and non-student populations is explained almost completely by the reduced access to firearms on college campuses. Consider that suicides committed with firearms represent only five percent of suicide attempts but more than half of suicide fatalities. About 1,100 college students commit suicide each year, and another 24,000 attempt to do so. Given that suicide attempts with a firearm are successful 90 percent of the time, each one of these more than 25,000 attempts would almost certainly result in death if carried out with a firearm. The best studies to date show that the majority of suicides are impulsive, with little deliberation prior to the act. We also know that youths between the ages of eighteen and twenty-five experience the highest rates of mental illness in the general population. These factors, combined with high rates of alcohol and drug abuse, provide a compelling reason to believe that the nation’s suicide rate will increase if firearms are allowed on college campuses.

### 1nc – pragmatism

thanks bennett

#### 1. bias – opposition to handgun bans is biased by symbolic racism and males disproportionately oppose gun control. Forrest et al. 13:

Walter [Behavioural Studies, Monash University, Melbourne, Australia] and Kerry O’Brien [Behavioural Studies, Monash University, Melbourne, Australia, School of Psychological Sciences, University of Manchester, Manchester, United Kingdom] and Dermot Lynott [Department of Psychology, Lancaster University, Lancaster, United Kingdom] and Michael Daly [Institute of Sociomanagement, University of Stirling, Stirling, Scotland, United Kingdom], “Racism, Gun Ownership and Gun Control: Biased Attitudes in US Whites May Influence Policy Decisions”, PLOS One, 31 Oct 2013, BE

Conservative ideology was also significantly related to stronger support for permits to carry concealed handguns after adjusting for other explanatory variables. Similarly, stronger republican identification, being from a southern state, and anti-government sentiment were associated with opposition to gun-control policies, but not with having a gun in the home. With the exception of sex, and to a much lesser extent education, demographic variables were not related to having a gun in the home or opposition to gun controls. Although sex was unrelated to having a gun in the home, **there were greater odds of males being opposed to banning handguns in the home**, and being supportive of permits to carry concealed handguns, **than for females. This result is consistent with other US data showing that white males display the most opposition to gun control, and greater support for liberalisation of gun laws** [3]. Higher education levels were associated with lower odds of having a gun in the home, but not with the gun control outcomes. This finding mirrors national data on gun ownership and support for gun control policies [3], which also shows a poor and mixed relationship between income and age, and gun ownership.¶ In correlation analyses, greater race IAT scores were weakly associated with greater symbolic racism scores, and with the black violent stereotype. Higher IAT scores were not related to gun ownership and gun control in full models. Higher scores on black violent stereotyping were not related to any of the gun-related outcomes; the univariate relationship between black violent stereotyping and greater support for concealed handgun permits was explained by other variables.¶ Discussion¶ Opposition to gun control in US whites is somewhat paradoxical given the statistics on gun-related deaths, and such opposition may be undermining the public health of all US citizens. This study examined for the first time whether racism is related to gun ownership and the opposition to gun control in US whites. The results support the hypothesis by showing that **greater symbolic racism is related to increased odds of having a gun in the home and greater opposition to gun control**, after accounting for all other explanatory variables.¶ It is particularly noteworthy that the relationship between symbolic racism and the gun-related outcomes was maintained in the presence of conservative ideologies, political affiliation, opposition to government control, and being from a southern state, which are otherwise strong predictors of gun ownership and opposition to gun reform. Contrary to research showing associations between implicit racism and policy decision making [23], we did not find implicit racism to be significantly related to gun related outcomes after accounting for other variables. Similarly, the small correlations between the stereotype that most blacks being violent and gun outcomes were not significant after accounting for all other variables.¶ There are several possible reasons for the absence of multivariate associations between the stereotype of blacks as violent and race-IAT, and gun outcomes. There is considerable debate in the field regards the validity and predictive qualities of implicit measures with critical reviews and reanalyses showing weak or no association between implicit and explicit measures, and outcomes [39], [40]. Others demonstrate that non-attitudinal factors, such as, stimuli familiarity, cognitive ability, and fear of appearing racist also account for individual differences in IAT scores, that may in turn affect associations with outcome variables [39]–[43]. The implicit association test is also a conceptually difficult task for some to learn, and particularly the brief race-IAT used in the ANES which restricts training on this computerized measure [41]. Given the mean D score for the ANES race-IAT (.17) is more than twice as small as from any other studies, including one in medical doctors [44], it is also possible that participants may not have completed this complex computerized task correctly. Other authors have noted this problem with the ANES race-IAT data [45].¶ There are two plausible reasons for the blacks as violent stereotype not accounting for significant variance in multivariate models. First, the stereotype appears to be subsumed by symbolic racism. Table 4 shows that the black violent stereotype has its strongest relationship with symbolic racism (r = .24), and only weak relationships with other variables (rs = .06–.09). Thus, the association between the black violent stereotype and gun outcomes may be explained through its association with symbolic racism which captures negative affect towards blacks (e.g., fear, unease, hostility). Alternatively, because the black violent stereotype is a quite blatant measure, participants may have been reluctant to endorse a clearly negative view of blacks in order to avoid appearing racist. In support of this notion, only 10% of participants strongly endorsed the statement that most blacks could be described as violent, with a mean score of 2.2 on the 5-point scale, compared to a mean score of 3.5 for symbolic racism on a 5-point scale.¶ There are potential limitations that should be noted. The item assessing having a gun in the home does not establish that the respondent is the owner or user of that gun. This observation is born out in the absence of a sex difference to this question. Males typically have a higher rate of gun ownership than females [3]. Similarly, the gun control policy items do not assess opposition/support for assault weapons, which has been a particular focus of attention during recent gun debates in the US. Nonetheless, symbolic racism might also, quite reasonably, be related to opposition to broader gun control measures (banning assault weapons, and gun clips containing more than 10 rounds), which may or may not be effective in reducing firearms related deaths. However, although the ANES only asked participants whether there was a gun in the home, best available evidence suggests that merely having a gun in the home is associated with a marked increase in the odds of one of the members of that home dying from suicide or homicide [6], [7].¶ Another potential limitation is the focus on white US adults as it is possible that other US racial groups may display similar pattern of results. However, given that whites oppose gun reforms to a considerably greater extent than do blacks, or indeed any other non-white racial group, that whites are also the single largest (>70%) ethnic grouping in the US, and that symbolic racism in whites is related to numerous outcomes, the focus of the study on whites seems appropriate [3]. Indeed, in a sub-analysis of the black sample from the ANES panel study, we found that none of the variables reported in models for white participants were significantly related to any of the gun-related outcomes for blacks. Finally, the correlational nature of the study clearly prohibits causal inferences. While a view that racism underpins gun-related attitudes is plausible and supported by evidence on other race-related policy decisions [18], [23], it could be argued that there are other plausible but unmeasured variables that could explain the pattern of relationships we find here. Similarly, simply owning a firearm may lead whites to develop more negative attitudes towards blacks. There is some experimental research showing that participants who have recently held a firearm produce enhanced salivary testosterone levels and display increased aggression toward others [46]. Causality aside, greater control of firearms is the most logical direction for public health policy.¶ Notwithstanding these limitations, the results indicate that **symbolic racism is associated with gun-related attitudes and behaviours in US whites. The statistics on firearm-related suicides and homicides in the US might reasonably be expected to convince US citizens that action on reducing gun ownership and use would be beneficial to their health**. Yet, US whites oppose strong gun reform more than all other racial groups, despite a much greater likelihood that whites will kill themselves with their guns (suicide), than be killed by someone else [1]. Black-on-black homicide rates would benefit most from gun reform, and, quite logically, blacks support these reforms even if whites do not [3], [47]. Symbolic racism appears to play a role in explaining gun ownership and paradoxical attitudes to gun control in US whites. In other words, despite certain policy changes potentially benefitting whites, **anti-black prejudice leads people to oppose their implementation**. This finding is consistent with previous research showing that symbolic racism is associated with opposition to US policies that may benefit blacks, and support for policies that disadvantage blacks, and critically, goes beyond what is explained by other important confounders.

#### Experimentation with controversial policies is key to adequately revise moral beliefs and helps us implement policies better in the future. Dewey 31:

John [American philosopher, psychologist, and educational reformer whose ideas have been influential in education and social reform], “Social Science and Social Control (1931)”, *The Essential Dewey Volume I: Pragmatism, Education, Democracy*, Edited by Larry A. Hickman and Thomas M. Alexander, Indiana University Press, 1998, BE

The point I am making may be summed up by saying that it is a complete error to suppose that efforts at social control depend upon the prior existence of a social science. The reverse is the case. **The building up of social science**, that is, of a body of knowledge in which facts are ascertained in their significant relations, **is dependent upon putting social planning into effect**. It is at this point that the misconception about physical science, when it is taken as a model for social knowledge, is important. **Physical science did not develop because inquirers piled up a mass of facts about observed phenomena. It came into being when** men **[people] intentionally experimented, on the basis of ideas and hypotheses**, with observed phenomena to modify them and dis- close new observations. **This process is self- corrective and self-developing. Imperfect and even wrong hypotheses, when acted upon, brought to light significant phenomena which made improved ideas and improved experimentations possible**. The change from a passive and accumulative attitude into an active and productive one is the secret revealed by the progress of physical inquiry. Men obtained knowledge of natural energies by trying deliberately to control the conditions of their operation. The result was knowledge, and then control on a larger scale by the application of what was learned.

#### 2. democracy – the mere existence of privately owned guns is a means of shutting down democratic deliberation. Debrabander 12:

FIRMIN [associate professor of philosophy at the Maryland Institute College of Art, Baltimore and the author of “Spinoza and the Stoics”], “The Freedom of an Armed Society”, NY Times, 16 Dec 2012, BE

**Individual gun ownership — and gun violence — has long been a distinctive feature of American society**, setting us apart from the other industrialized democracies of the world. Recent legislative developments, however, are progressively bringing guns out of the private domain, with the ultimate aim of enshrining them in public life. Indeed, the N.R.A. strives for a day when the open carry of powerful weapons might be normal, a fixture even, of any visit to the coffee shop or grocery store — or classroom.¶ As N.R.A. president Wayne LaPierre expressed in a recent statement on the organization’s Web site, more guns equal more safety, by their account. A favorite gun rights saying is “an armed society is a polite society.” If we allow ever more people to be armed, at any time, in any place, this will provide a powerful deterrent to potential criminals. Or if more citizens were armed — like principals and teachers in the classroom, for example — they could halt senseless shootings ahead of time, or at least early on, and save society a lot of heartache and bloodshed.¶ **As ever more people are armed in public, however — even brandishing weapons on the street — this is no longer recognizable as a civil society. Freedom is vanished at that point**.¶ And yet, gun rights advocates famously maintain that individual gun ownership, even of high caliber weapons, is the defining mark of our freedom as such, and the ultimate guarantee of our enduring liberty. Deeper reflection on their argument exposes basic fallacies.¶ In her book “The Human Condition,” the philosopher Hannah Arendt states that “violence is mute.” According to Arendt, speech dominates and distinguishes the polis, the highest form of human association, which is devoted to the freedom and equality of its component members. **Violence — and the threat of it — is a pre-political manner of communication and control, characteristic of undemocratic organizations and hierarchical relationships. For the ancient Athenians who practiced an incipient, albeit limited form of democracy** (one that we surely aim to surpass), **violence was characteristic of the master-slave relationship, not that of free citizens**.¶ This becomes clear if only you pry a little more deeply into the N.R.A.’s logic behind an armed society. **An armed society is polite, by their thinking, precisely because guns would compel everyone to tamp down eccentric behavior**, and refrain from actions that might seem threatening. **The suggestion is that guns liberally interspersed throughout society would cause us all to walk gingerly — not make any sudden, unexpected moves — and watch what we say, how we act, whom we might offend**.¶ As our Constitution provides, however, liberty entails precisely the freedom to be reckless, within limits, also the freedom to insult and offend as the case may be. The Supreme Court has repeatedly upheld our right to experiment in offensive language and ideas, and in some cases, offensive action and speech. Such experimentation is inherent to our freedom as such. But **guns** by their nature do not mix with this experiment — they don’t mix with taking offense. They **are combustible ingredients in assembly and speech**.¶ I often think of the armed protestor who showed up to one of the famously raucous town hall hearings on Obamacare in the summer of 2009. The media was very worked up over this man, who bore a sign that invoked a famous quote of Thomas Jefferson, accusing the president of tyranny. But no one engaged him at the protest; no one dared approach him even, for discussion or debate — though this was a town hall meeting, intended for just such purposes. **Such is the effect of guns on speech — and assembly. Like it or not, they transform the bearer, and end the conversation in some fundamental way. They announce that the conversation is not completely unbounded, unfettered and free; there is or can be a limit to negotiation and debate — definitively**.¶ The very power and possibility of free speech and assembly rests on their non-violence. **The power of the Occupy Wall Street movement, as well as the Arab Spring protests, stemmed precisely from their non-violent nature.** This power was made evident by the ferocity of government response to the Occupy movement. Occupy protestors across the country were increasingly confronted by police in military style garb and affect.¶ **Imagine what this would have looked like had the protestors been armed**: in the face of the New York Police Department assault on Zuccotti Park, there might have been armed insurrection in the streets. **The non-violent nature of protest in this country ensures that it can occur**.

#### Democracy is an important form of inquiry and experimentation. Fentenstein 14:

Matthew [Matthew Festenstein (BA Cambridge, PhD Cambridge) previously taught at the Universities of Hull and Sheffield. Matthew arrived as Professor of Political Philosophy at York in 2006. He was Director of the Morrell Centre for Toleration 2006-8, Research Director in the Politics Department 2008-9, and Head of Department 2010-15. He is currently Associate Dean for Research in the Faculty of Social Sciences and director of the Research Centre for Social Sciences], "Dewey's Political Philosophy", The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy (Spring 2014 Edition), Edward N. Zalta (ed.), BE

This way of viewing the desirability of democracy is instrumental and minimal; instrumental, in that the **desirability of democracy derives from its protecting the interests of each individual against the depredations of an elite class**, and minimal, in that the rationale for popular participation is limited to the need for the elite to be informed where the shoe pinches, if its policies are not to be misguided. **Dewey deepens this minimal and instrumental justification by taking democracy to** be a form of social inquiry**: Democracy as public discussion is viewed as the best way of dealing with the conflict of interests in a society**: ‘The method of democracy – inasfar as it is that of organized intelligence – is to bring these conflicts out into the open where their special claims can be discussed and judged in the light of more inclusive interests than are represented by either of them separately’ (Liberalism and Social Action, LW11, 56). Democratic societies are thought of as both seeking to attain desirable goals, and arguing over how to do so, and also as arguing over what a desirable goal is. In other words, **democratic politics is** not simply a channel through which we can assert our interests (as it is for the first argument), but **a forum or mode of activity in which we can arrive at a conception of what our interests are. As the experimentalist conception of inquiry insists, this does not imply that we need a priori criteria in order to establish if this process has been successful**. Rather, criteria for what counts as a satisfactory solution may be hammered out in the process of searching for one. Democracy is experimental for Dewey in that **it allows, or should allow, a profound questioning of the idées fixes of the established order**, even if, of course, much democratic politics will not take the form of such questioning.

## frontlines

### a2 perm

#### Even if the second amendment allows for guns, if I win there is one instance in which the first amendment protect guns as speech, then a) prohibiting guns restricts some speech b) its mutually exclusive – Blanchfield 14 says waving guns at pro 2nd amendment protests is a form of symbolic speech.

#### Severance bad – [A] kills neg strategy because they can literally take away portions of the 1AC that I link disads to – makes it impossible to be negative which means it outweighs [B] makes the aff a moving target and encourages being sketchy in order to shift out of their position – kills advocacy skills because thye never have to defend against well researched objections. Advocacy skills is a voter because otherwise we’re speaking without debating and it’s an important out of round skill we develop form debate.

### a2 gourevitch

#### 1. Allowing guns on campus is worse for over policing. DeFillipis 14:

Evan, graduated number one in his class at the University of Oklahoma with degrees in Economics, Political Science, and Psychology. He is a Harry S. Truman Scholar, a David L. Boren Critical Languages Scholar, and currently works as a research analyst at Quest Opportunity Fund. His work on gun violence has been featured in Washington Post, Atlantic, Slate, VICE, Huffington Post, Vox, Media Matters, Boston Review, and many others. “Campus Gun Control Works- Why Guns and Schools Do Not Mix” Jun 07, 2014. https://www.armedwithreason.com/campus-gun-control-works-why-guns-and-schools-do-not-mix/ SA-IB

In a recent editorial in the Chronicle of Higher Education, former Idaho State University Provost Gary Olson spoke to the realities of firearms on campus, their limited potential to improve safety, and the near certainty that they would have the opposite effect. “There is no recorded incident in which a [survivor] victim—or spectator—of a violent crime on a campus has prevented that crime by brandishing a weapon,” Olson wrote. “In fact, campus police officers report that increasing the number of guns on a campus would increase police problems exponentially, especially in ‘active shooter’ situations.” Ninety-five percent of university presidents share his opposition to concealed carrying on campus.

#### 2. Cross-apply the first DeFillipis card – says that the alterative would require more police because they would need to monitor each possessor of firearms to make sure they are responsible.

#### 3. if this is true, then drug policies would non-unique this – the solvency of the cp would outweigh a drop in the bucket increase in policing.